



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ANTIOCHIAN RECENSION OF THE SEPTUAGINT<sup>1</sup>

BY GEORGE F. MOORE

Harvard University

The repeated references of Jerome to revised editions of the Greek Old Testament, and particularly his statement that in his own time three recensions were current, that of Hesychius in Alexandria and Egypt, that of Origen as published by Eusebius and Pamphilus in Palestine, and that of Lucian from Antioch to Constantinople, did not fail to attract the notice of the learned critics of the seventeenth century, who collected all that could be found in the Fathers and other sources about these editions, their authors, and character. Codices of the second class (Palestinian recension), furnished with Origen's asterisks and obeli, and often with a select critical apparatus exhibiting variant renderings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, they recognized as hexaplar by these external indications; but no such criterion was available for the Antiochian or the Alexandrian recensions. The accounts of Lucian's procedure which may be gathered from later writers<sup>2</sup> are—apart from the question of their historical value—too vague to serve as such a criterion,<sup>3</sup> and for

<sup>1</sup> E. Hautsch, *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch*. Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, 1909, pp. 518-543.

M. L. Margolis, *The K Text of Joshua*. American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XXVIII, 1-55 (October, 1911).

H. A. Sanders, *The Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua*. New York: Macmillan, 1910.

A. Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher* (Septuaginta-Studien, 3. Heft). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.

<sup>2</sup> See Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, etc. (1705), pp. 302 f.; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 3, pp. 291 f.

<sup>3</sup> J. Dahse (*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXVIII [1908], 1-21, 161-173) has attempted a classification of the codices in Genesis on a very slender basis, and the identification of his groups on a still slenderer one. He picks out for "Lucian" 53, 56, 129 (Reckendorf had shown that in Genesis the Ethiopic version frequently goes with 56, 129); for Hesychius, he sees no reason why 52, 54, 57 should not be assigned to him. But 54 is often in company with 44, 75, 106, 134; Holmes thought that 15, 44, 75, 106, were Tetraplar; Nickes that 44, 71, 74, 76, 106, 236 were Hesychian. Dahse conjectures that the latter represent a recension made by Eusebius, in compliance with Constantine's order for fifty Bibles; Eusebius will have made a compromise text, combining Origen and Lucian (or the *Kouij*). Hautsch (*op. cit.*, 519 f.) has criticized the ascription of 53, 56, 129 to Lucian. The other conjectures need no commentary.

Hesychius there is not even a worthless tradition. There was, therefore, a free field for guesses; Ussher, for example, conjectured that the Alexandrine Codex, whose wide departures from the Roman edition in Jos., Jud., 3 Reg., and Job he had acutely observed, might be Hesychian.<sup>4</sup> The knowledge of the manuscript tradition was too incomplete and accidental to permit any methodical approach to the discrimination of recensions.

This knowledge was notably enlarged by the labors of many scholars of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries; Walton's Polyglott (1657) and the collection of the remains of Origen's Hexapla by Montfaucon (1713) may be mentioned as way-marks. At the end of the eighteenth century (1798) appeared the first volume of the Oxford Septuagint (Holmes and Parsons), which for the first time put into the hands of critics with something like completeness the evidence of the manuscripts, cursive as well as uncial, of the quotations in the ecclesiastical writers, and of the secondary versions made from the Greek. This immense apparatus made a grouping of manuscripts by families possible, and, indeed, necessary, if any kind of order was to be brought out of its chaos, and the question of recensions was in consequence revived. Holmes himself, in his preface to the first volume, noted that codex 58 throughout the Pentateuch, with 72 in Gen.-Lev., contained a peculiar text, while 19, 108, 118 exhibited a second type distinct at once from the hexaplar codices and from the common run of manuscripts, and he threw out the surmise that these two groups represented the recensions of Lucian and Hesychius, but recognized that the point could be settled only by a patient investigation.<sup>5</sup> The coherence of the group 19, 108, 118 is well established, and Holmes's observation so far confirmed.<sup>6</sup> It is not improbable that, had he lived to edit the Historical Books, he would have discovered the evidence which led more recent scholars to associate this family with the name of Lucian. In the seventh decade of the last century several scholars made this connection. Vercellone, indeed, went no farther than to define the group in the Historical Books (19, 82, 93, 108), and point out that the excerpts

<sup>4</sup> Syntagma (1655), c. 9 (Works, VII, 531). So also Isaac Voss (1663), and others.

<sup>5</sup> The relation of 19, 108 to the Complutensian edition did not escape him.

<sup>6</sup> Of the other MSS which are added to this group in Sam.-Kings, 93 begins with Ruth, while 82 has in the Octateuch a text of entirely different character.

from an Old Latin translation preserved on the margin of a Vulgate Codex from Leon in Spain (Cod. Goth. Legionensis) were cognate.<sup>7</sup> Ceriani, however, Field (following Ceriani), and Lagarde,<sup>8</sup> proceeded to identify the text of this family of manuscripts with the Antiochian recension (Lucian). The chief ground of this identification was the agreement between this text and the quotations from the Books of Samuel and Kings in the Fathers of the fourth and fifth century who certainly used the Antiochian Bible, especially Chrysostom and Theodoret. It was confirmed by the fact that characteristic readings of the group in question are sometimes found on the margin of manuscripts, both Greek and Syriac, with the signature *Lo*, or *L*,<sup>9</sup> which, as Theodoret and the author of a letter in Arabic prefixed to a manuscript of the hexaplar Syriac attest, stands for Lucian (Loukianos).

For the books of Samuel and Kings the evidence is indeed conclusive, and is not likely to be impugned from any quarter. But it was a grave, though not unnatural, mistake to infer, without further investigation, that the same group of manuscripts represented the Antiochian recension in the Octateuch also. Field had pertinently remarked (1875) that the case was not so plain in the Pentateuch as it was in Kings; but others were less cautious, and it speedily became the unquestioned doctrine that 19, 108, 118 were "Lucianic" codices throughout. In 1883 Lagarde published his *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars Prior* (Genesis-Esther), based on this family of manuscripts, as "Luciani recognitio," and commentators at once began to operate with "Lucian" (i.e., Lagarde) as naïvely as they had long operated with "the LXX" (i.e., Tischendorf), or as those who want to be up to date now perform with Swete's accidental apparatus.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones*, II, 436 (1864). See also Wellhausen, *Text der Bücher Samuelis* (1871), 221 ff.

<sup>8</sup> On the point of priority, see Ceriani, *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo*, Ser. 2 Vol. XIX (1886), 206 ff.

<sup>9</sup> So far as the Greek MSS are concerned, it had been noted in the seventeenth century that the readings on the margin of Cod. Barberini (H.-P. 86), with the signature *Λ* were thus attributed to Lucian (Ussher; cf. Hody). Montfaucon resolved the contraction by *Λοίτοι*, and thus put criticism off the track. Field, in the greater part of his Hexapla, follows Montfaucon in this error.

<sup>10</sup> The inclusion of an uncial codex in this apparatus is not determined by its importance—some of the most important are excluded—but by the fact that it has been photographically reproduced.

The Book of Judges presents to the student of the Greek versions peculiar problems. Bonfrère, in an outline of critical introduction prefixed to his Commentary on the Pentateuch (Amsterdam, 1625),<sup>11</sup> undertook to test the existing editions of the Septuagint (Complutensian and Regia, Aldine [in Brylinger's reprint], and Sixtine) by comparison with the quotations in the Fathers, and discovered that the Song of Deborah, Judg., chap. 5, in the Roman edition (based on B), differed totally from the quotations in Origen, Augustine, Theodoret, and Procopius; the differences were so great, "ut plane diversa versio videri possit." Ussher compared the Roman edition of Judges with the (then unpublished) Alexandrine manuscript with a similar result, and to show the extent of the divergence he printed two chapters (6 and 18), setting the two texts in parallel columns. He compared also Cod. Sarravianus and the Aldine edition, bringing out the fact that these stood on the side of A, not of the Sixtine text (B).<sup>12</sup> Grabe (1705)<sup>13</sup> proved, by an investigation running through the whole book, that the text of Judges presented in the Roman edition is not quoted by any of the Alexandrian Fathers prior to Cyrill,<sup>14</sup> all the earlier quotations being of the type of text contained in A; and he inferred that B exhibits the recension of Hesychius. Fritzsche, in his edition of Judges,<sup>15</sup> endeavored to distinguish three types of text; first, the oldest, represented by B, 16, 57, 76, etc.; second, the *Koinḗ*, in which he includes AGMN (H.-P. III, IV, X, XI), 15, 18, 19, 29, 30, 64, 71, 108, 121; in this family minor groups may be distinguished, M, N, 29, 71, 121; 19, 108, Compl.; and finally, a third family, K,<sup>16</sup> 44, 54, 59, 75, 76, 84, 106, 128, 134. The last named he confidently takes for the recension of Lucian, on no firmer ground, so far as appears, than that the work of Lucian was a revision of the *Koinḗ*; about Hesychius he is not so confident, but, if he were to make a guess, would suggest IV or 19 (*n.b.!*). Fritzsche made no attempt to verify these conjectures by comparing the

<sup>11</sup> In totam Scripturam Sacram praeoqua.

<sup>12</sup> Syntagma (Appendix), Works, VII, 578 ff.

<sup>13</sup> Epistola ad . . . Jo. Millium.

<sup>14</sup> The few quotations in Athanasius leave the matter doubtful.

<sup>15</sup> Liber Judicum, 1867.

<sup>16</sup> K is Brooke's and Maclean's signature for an uncial (fragments) published by Tischendorf, Monumenta Sacra, I, 171-176.

quotations in the Fathers or the versions; the entire neglect of this evidence, even when it was put under his eyes by Parsons or Grabe, is a conspicuous defect of his edition, while in setting aside Grabe's demonstration and treating B and its train of cursives as the source from which the so-called *Koumḗ* in all its forms was derived, he takes a long step backward.

At the meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in May, 1890,<sup>17</sup> I read a paper on "The Greek Versions of Judges," in which, with Grabe, I recognized two distinct, though not necessarily entirely independent, translations, one contained in B and a considerable family of cursives (including the text of the Catena Nicephori), the Sahidic version (of which only small fragments were then known), and the quotations in Cyrill of Alexandria (became bishop, 412); the other, in varying forms, in all the other witnesses. In the investigation of the latter, certain more or less clearly marked families emerged, and among them one which has all the characters of a distinct recension, viz., K, 54, 59, 75,<sup>18</sup> with which 82 less constantly consorts. "The numerous and extended quotations from Judges in Theodoret's *Quaestiones* agree most closely with 54, 59, 75 (82), where they stand entirely alone. . . . His text had the longer additions which we now read in these manuscripts, for after quoting the beginning of Jud. 2:10, he summarizes the contents of the addition in 54, 59, 75 (121 sub obel.) and vs. 11. So far as Judges is concerned, Theodoret's text<sup>19</sup> is not L (Lagarde) but that of K, 54, 59, 75. Whether this is true of the rest of the Octateuch, remains to be seen."<sup>20</sup> I may add that this conclusion was based on a critical apparatus (MS) in which the entire body of evidence was collated with the text of 54 cet. in such a way as to bring out the relations of the witnesses in strong relief. In the same paper, I outlined, with numerous illustrations, the characteristics of the recension—the corrections after the Hebrew, the improvements of the Greek, the elucidating glosses, and so on.

<sup>17</sup> Journal of Biblical Literature, Proceedings, May, 1890, p. ii.

<sup>18</sup> An important addition to his array has recently been made by the publication of the Codex Zuqninensis; see below, p. 57 and n. 43.

<sup>19</sup> I intentionally avoided using the name Lucian, being convinced that the fallacy of labels had done too much mischief already in Old Testament criticism.

<sup>20</sup> MS of the paper referred to above.

About the same time, I communicated the results I had reached to Lagarde, and learned from his reply that he was on the point of printing the two Greek versions of Judges face to face, with a double apparatus, and I accordingly deferred the publication of my own studies till I should have opportunity to compare them with Lagarde's.<sup>21</sup> Pressure of other obligations, especially the completion of my Commentary on Judges, pushed the matter aside for the time, and I laid the paper by till I should have opportunity to make fresh collations of the cursives of the group, of which I projected an edition. The results only were briefly stated in the Commentary (1895, pp. xlv f.), and in "A Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Judges" (Polychrome Bible, 1900, p. 22).<sup>22</sup> Lagarde's edition made plain to the dullest vision what Bonfrère and Ussher and Grabe had seen with sharp eyes, that B is a distinct version, but his restricted, and somewhat arbitrarily selected, apparatus did not disclose the relations of the families or recensions of the common version.

E. Hautsch has recently taken up the problem of the Antiochian recension in the Octateuch, in a somewhat cursory manner.<sup>23</sup> In Judges he arrives at the same result which I came to twenty years before, namely, that the Bible of Theodoret is most purely represented in **54, 59, 75**, with which group **44** (in part of the book), **82, 84, 106, 134** are frequently joined. He thinks, however, that Theodoret in some passages has characteristic readings of the B text, and emphasizes the importance of this observation: these quotations show that the text of Lucian had already suffered contamination, within the Antiochian school itself, from the "Hesychian" recension—if it may be assumed, with Grabe, that B is "Hesychian." Three such instances are alleged, viz., Judg. 1:19; 7:6; 12:6. In the first and the last Hautsch's trouble arises from defective attention to the evidence or erroneous interpretation of it; in 7:6, he has not observed that Theodoret's interpretation is derived from Josephus.

<sup>21</sup> Lagarde's paper was communicated to the Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, June 7, 1890, and appeared in the *Abhandlungen*, Vol. XXXVII, 189 (Septuaginta Studien, Erster Theil).

<sup>22</sup> This recital of my own part in the recognition of the K group in Judges as the Antiochian recension is not made from any vain concern about "priority," but to make clear that the brief statement in the Commentary to which Hautsch and Tisserant have referred was not a random guess, but was based on a complete analysis of the evidence.

<sup>23</sup> *Der Lukiantext des Oktateuch*, 1909.

Judg. 1:19: "Thdt I, 323 hat in der Überschrift zu Quaestio vi am Schluss von vs. 19 die Worte: *οτι ρηχαβ διεστειλατο αυτοις*. Sie fehlen zwar bei "Pic. u. Cod." [1], werden jedoch in der folgenden Erklärung deutlich vorausgesetzt. Dies ist die Form, welche der Schluss von 1:19 im B-Texte hat [2]. Die meisten Vertreter des A-Textes bieten: *οτι ρηχαβ διεστειλατο αυτην αρματα σιδηρα αυτοις* [3] (also die Kombination zweier verschiedener Übersetzungen der hebräischen Worte *יִרְיָ רַכַּב בְּרִזְלָ לָהֶם*).<sup>24</sup>

(1) Hautsch has misread Schulze's note, which says expressly that Picus' edition contained the words in question. (2) It is true that B ends the verse with these words, but it should not be overlooked that the whole array of B's cursive satellites add *καὶ ἄρματα σιδηρὰ αὐτοῖς*, as does also the newly published Sahidic of Thompson. Under these circumstances, it might be questioned whether the words are not missing from B by a simple homoeoteleuton, but the fact that Aeth. agrees with B dissuades from this explanation. (3) The text which Hautsch attributes to the most of the representatives of the A text does not exist in any manuscript. In A, 19, 108, Lag., the verse ends, *οτι Ρηχαβ διεστειλατο αυτην* [sc. *την κοιλάδα*]. The second translation is coupled on by *καὶ* in all the forms of the text in which it is introduced: so in B's satellites; in XI (N); in 118, Compl.; in 121, Ald.; and in 75. Codd. 82, 84, 106, 134, and others insert *ην* before the last *αὐτοῖς*; 16, 44 have *αὐτούς* for the first *αὐτοῖς*; 18, 209, Cat. Nic., τὰ ἄρματα. The testimony therefore is: *οτι Ρηχαβ διεστειλατο αὐτοῖς* [*αὐτούς*], *καὶ* (τὰ) ἄρματα σιδηρὰ (*ην*) αὐτοῖς. But 54 and 59 do not have this addition, and inasmuch as Theodoret quotes *καὶ οὐκ ἐδύνατο*, which 54, 59 (*ἡδύνατο*), with numerous other representatives of the A text have, while B and all its tribe have *ἡδυνάσθησαν* or *ἡδυνήσθησαν*, it is a plain case that Theodoret is here, as elsewhere, following 54 cet., not B. The hexaplar Syriac has only *ܕܝܚܚܐܒ ܕܝܥܬܝܠܐܬܐ ܕܝܚܚܐܒ ܕܝܥܬܝܠܐܬܐ*, without note or sign.

That Theodoret did not find the iron chariots in his text is clear from his interpretation; he makes Rechab a pious Israelite who bade the tribe leave the plain and inhabit in the hills, on account of the godlessness of the inhabitants of the plain and the temptations to commerce with foreigners which the proximity of the sea would bring.

In 12:6 Hautsch finds the matter "more complicated": the Quaestio reads, without variant, *τί ἐστιν, εἶπατε δὴ σύνθημα*; as in the solid tradition of the A text; only B and Thompson's Sahidic have *εἶπον δὴ στάχυς*.<sup>25</sup> Dr. Hautsch is convinced that the question must originally have been in the latter form: as it is now, it does not tally with the answer. This is, however, only because Dr. Hautsch has not understood the answer: it is precisely *σύνθημα* in this context that Theodoret explains. The translator, unable to reproduce the particular form of the *shibboleth* test, made the situation

<sup>24</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 537.

<sup>25</sup> The cursives of B's family unanimously, so far as appears, read, *εἶπατε δὴ σύνθημα, καὶ οὐ κατεύθυναν τοῦ λαλεῖν κατὰ τὸ αὐτό*.



intelligible to his readers: the guard at the ford demanded of the Ephraimites a pass-word (*σύνθημα*), καὶ λέγοντες σύνθημα οὐ κατηύθυνον τοῦ λαλῆσαι (54 cet., all other families to the same effect), "they did not utter it right." Theodoret explains that *σύνθημα* is here not an ordinary pass-word, or countersign, by acquaintance with which a man proves himself a friend (Suidas, s.v. *σύνθημα*, λόγος ἐν πολέμῳ ἐπὶ γνωρισμῷ τῶν οἰκείων διδόμενος); the test was not knowledge of the parole, but *pronunciation* of a pass-word which the challenger bade the challenged party say. Jephthah directed his men to ask *τινα λόγον*, ὃς ἐπέφερε διὰ τῆς γλώττης τὸν ἔλεγχον. There were differences of dialect among the Israelites, as there were different dialects of Syriac. The nature of the test may be seen from the Syrian version (δ Σύρος), according to which, τῶν ἄλλων τὸν ἄσταχυν σεμβλα καλούντων, οἱ τοῦ Ἐφραιμ ἔκ τινος συνηθείας < σεμβελω > ἔλεγον.—Thdt's ἄσταχυς does not come from the Greek of B, but is an interpretation of the Syriac ܣܡܒܠܐ; cf. Jerome, Dic *Sciboleth*, quod interpretatur *Spica*. Note also 85: εἵπατε σύνθημα, mg. σεβελω: καὶ εἶπε ταχυς [l. στάχυς], and Syr. hex.

In Judg. 7:6, Theodoret follows Josephus (Antt. v. 6, 3): the three hundred were the poorest soldiers in the host. Compare the words of Theodoret which seem to Hautsch most clearly to show acquaintance with the B text, τῇ δὲ χειρὶ τὸ νᾶμα προσενεγκόντων τῷ στόματι, with Josephus, ταῖς χερσὶ . . . προσενεγκάμενοι τὸ ὕδωρ. The verb προσφέρω is appropriate to ἐν χειρὶ, or χερσί (they carried the water with their hands to their mouths). In C, on the contrary, λαψάντων or λειξάντων imperatively demand τῇ γλωσσῇ, which is probably as old as the first translation. The κλιθέντων, on which Hautsch also lays weight (B ἔκλιναν; the others ἐκαμψαν, etc.), is to be compared with Josephus, κατακλιθέντας. Josephus reproduces the story freely, and may well have had the Hebrew text in mind; he does not suggest any type of the Greek text. Theodoret's unquestionable dependence on Josephus accounts for all the phenomena in which Hautsch discovers acquaintance with a B text.

Of contamination of the Antiochian recension from the "Hesychian" B there is in none of these passages the slightest trace.

In Joshua, Hautsch finds the quotations of the Antiochian Fathers to agree, not with 19, 108 (Lagarde's "Lucian"), but with 44, 54, 75, 76, 84, 106, 134; and here again, as in Judges, Theodoret stands in a peculiarly close relation to 54, 75 (59 in Joshua goes in other company). Why Hautsch, in Joshua as well as in Judges, entirely neglects K, the only uncial of the class known previous to the publication of the Zuqninensis, is hard to imagine; that it was a member of the family in which he is particularly interested was noted by Tischendorf in the Introduction to his publication of the

fragments (1855),<sup>26</sup> and its closer relation to **54, 59, 75**, Thdt, was easily to be seen from my Commentary on Judges.

This neglect is far more than made good by M. Margolis, "The K Text of Joshua,"<sup>27</sup> a preliminary study to an edition of this recension. As a specimen of text-critical study, it would be difficult to praise this work beyond its deserts. For the uncial manuscripts, the phototype reproductions have been used, for the cursives, photographs; for the versions, the best available editions; even the Sahidic of Thompson, which appeared after the article was in type, is collated separately in the Introduction. The only exception to the completeness of the apparatus is the absence of quotations in Josephus and the Fathers. The distribution of the complicated testimony is such as to make the relations of the families or recensions apparent to the eye. The text of K is reprinted from Tischendorf's *Monumenta*; beneath the text the other witnesses are disposed in a triple apparatus, *first*, the variants of **54, 75, 118** (ros; including orthographic differences), and the Old Latin of Cod. Lugdunensis; *second*, the readings of **84, 134, 76, 74** (u l p t), and of **106**, Cod. Gr. Par. 609, **44** (f i z); *third*, the uncials, BAΘ (Washington Codex) G, **55**, Lagarde's ed., Syro-hexaplar, Ethiopic (Dillmann's codd. FH), Sahidic (Ciasca); finally, an ample commentary on the apparatus. The characteristics of the individual manuscripts of the K group are defined. It comes out that of the cursives, **54** (f) is the best; but the photographs show that this codex introduces *in the line*<sup>28</sup> readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, with the usual signatures for these translators (α' σ' θ'). It is obvious that the accidental omission of the signature in such a case would immediately produce a mechanical conflation of readings which might prove peculiarly puzzling to the critic. Perhaps the codex from which **54** was transcribed, or a more remote ancestor, had the readings of Aquila and the rest, not in the margin, as Margolis suggests, but between the lines of text, as is the case in Paris Nat. Reg. Gr. 131 (Swete, Introduction, p. 153).

<sup>26</sup> Tischendorf rightly observes that in Joshua and Judges its text differs from both B and A, and is supported especially by **75, 54, 118, 44, 59, 74, 76, 84, 106, 134**.

<sup>27</sup> American Journal of Semitic Languages, XXVIII, 1-55.

<sup>28</sup> Not in the margin, as Parsons says.

On page 24 Margolis discusses the relation of **74, 76, 84, 134** (U), and **44, 106** (F), to K, **54, 75**, in Joshua: "The data so far accumulated show that group (UF) to have been contaminated with the parallel recension of Origen; its variants therefore belong in the apparatus: in so far as they are not taken from Origen, they may exhibit readings of the K recension which ascend to a parallel archetype, and here and there may be preferred to those of the archetype of K and its consorts."

This result accords with the hypothesis I formed many years ago of the relation of **44-134** to K, **54, 59, 75**, in Judges; though I should not, so far as my observation goes, be confident that Origen was the sole source of the contamination.

Margolis does not attempt to place this recension; he records Hautsch's conclusion that **54, 75** are the Lucianic recension, but expresses no judgment upon it: "Whether 'Lucian' or not, it is certainly a recension, and it is just as manifest that it is not Origen's." The discrimination of recensions, and the exact knowledge of their characteristics based on a minute study of their representative codices and secondary versions, the determination of the relation of other manuscripts to the purer exponents of the type—e.g., in this instance, of **74, 76, 84, 134**, and of **44, 106**, to the central group K, **54, 75, 118**—is the immediate task of criticism; the hasty labelling of the recension "Lucian" or what not, can, at this stage, add nothing to the knowledge which the study of the text itself yields, and may hinder the progress of criticism by leading us erroneously to carry over results obtained elsewhere, as Lagarde's "Lucian" unquestionably did. X and Y (or L, M, N, which I used in my Judges), are just as good names as Lucian and Hesychius, for the time being, and prejudice no future investigation.

If this cautious attitude needed any justification, it would find it in the fullest measure in H. A. Sanders' monograph on "The Washington Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua."<sup>29</sup> Professor Sanders, whose services in connection with the phototype reproduction of this manuscript, and in the endeavor to determine its age on palaeographic evidence, must be gratefully acknowledged, gives, in

<sup>29</sup> It is to be regretted that the symbol  $\Theta$  should have been chosen for this codex, since Theodotion is customarily thus designated.

the publication referred to above, a collation of the text of the two books with that of B as printed in Swete's manual edition. He has also, with great pains, compared the readings of the Washington Codex with that of the other uncials included in Swete's apparatus and with the Old Latin (chiefly Cod. Lugdunensis), counting its agreements with these witnesses singly and in various combinations, as well as its singular readings, in order to determine its affinities and the weight to be given to it in different company. The question of "hexaplaric" readings in the manuscript is also discussed at some length.<sup>30</sup> In this discussion and in the examination of the singular readings of Θ, the cursives are necessarily drawn into the scope of the investigation. In dealing with them Professor Sanders writes of the "Lucianic" and the "Hesychian" codices of Deuteronomy and Joshua as if these recensions were as well known as A and B. "Lucianic" stands, of course, for 19, 82,<sup>31</sup> 108, 118 (Lagarde's "Lucian"); by "Hesychian" he understands 44, 74, 76, 106, 134 (p. 43). In classifying and labelling the manuscripts, he seems to have followed Norman McLean, who, as one of the editors of the larger Cambridge Septuagint, might be supposed to be an authority on the subject.<sup>32</sup> It has been shown above, however, that in Joshua and

<sup>30</sup> If I understand the argument, the author thinks that the "Hexaplaric glosses" in Θ came through "Lucian" (p. 38).

<sup>31</sup> Cod. 82 is cited as Lucianic even in Deuteronomy.

<sup>32</sup> Journal of Theological Studies, II (January, 1901), 306: "Thanks to the labours of Ceriani, Lagarde, and Field, it is now usual to recognize in three well-marked groups of LXX manuscripts of the Octateuch representatives of (1) the Lucianic or Syrian (Holmes' 19, 82, 108, 118), (2) the Hesychian or Egyptian (44, 74, 76, 84, 106, 134, &c), and (3) the Eusebian (Eusebio-Pamphilian) or Palestinian (IV, 38, 58, 72, &c) recensions. Another important group consists of 54, 75, and (to some extent) 59; while a fifth is formed of a number of manuscripts accompanied by a Catena." McLean is quoted for the identification of Hesychius by Nestle, Dictionary of the Bible, IV (1902), 445.

One unfamiliar with the history of criticism might gather from this statement that Ceriani, Lagarde, and Field, among them had proved that 44 and its congeners in the Octateuch represent the Alexandrian-Egyptian recension, and that the result was generally accepted—neither of which things is true. (Hautsch, in the article referred to above [p. 542], had already remarked that what McLean says about the Hesychian recension must rest on an error.)

As a matter of fact, the theory that 44, 71, 74, 106, 236 contain the recension of Hesychius seems to have been first propounded by J. P. Nickes (*De Veteris Testamenti codicum familiis*, 1853), on the ground of a cursory investigation of the grouping of the manuscripts in Judith, Tobit, and 1 Esdras—from which to the Octateuch is a far cry. Ceriani's masterly work on the Prophets (*De Codice Marchaliano . . . prophetarum . . . commentatio*, 1890), which showed that 106, with 26, 198, 306, and some others agreed with the quotations of Cyrill and the Memphitic Coptic, and therefore were presumably Hesychian, was still in a different field, and concerned only one of the manuscripts which McLean takes for this recension in the Octateuch.

Judges, and if Hautsch's investigation be confirmed, in the Pentateuch also, 19, 108, are not representatives of the Antiochian recension. The problem of the Alexandrian-Egyptian recension has never been methodically investigated for the Octateuch or any part of it. The attribution of 44, 74, 106, 134 to "Hesychius" is the result of a process of elimination. After (falsely) ascribing 19, 82, 108, 118 to "Lucian," 44, etc. were left over; what should they be but Hesychius?

The recent publication of almost all of Joshua and Judges in the Sahidic version (of which previously only inconsiderable fragments were accessible) may be expected to contribute to the recognition of the type of text current in Upper Egypt in the fourth century A.D. Whether this new evidence, in connection with the quotations in the Alexandrian and Egyptian writers of the same age, will enable us to identify this text with the recension of Hesychius is another question.

As for the so-called "Hesychian" codices, 44, 74, 76, 84, 106, 134, the one well-established fact is that they are related to K, Z, 54, (59), 75, with which, indeed, they were by earlier critics included in one family (Fritzsche's "Lucian"). In Joshua and Judges, where alone the question has been investigated even superficially, they exhibit many of the characteristic readings of the K group, but interspersed or conflate with readings of a different character and origin.<sup>33</sup> The evidence which Hautsch has collected goes to show that in the Pentateuch, also, the Antiochian Fathers, Chrysostom and Theodoret, quote a text which, when it departs from the common type, corresponds to that contained in (44), 54, (59), 75, 76, 106, 134, Theodoret standing especially close to 54, (59), 75.<sup>34</sup>

Professor Sanders has observed that the Washington Manuscript, especially in Deuteronomy, very often agrees with 54, 75, or one of them. In the first five chapters of Deuteronomy, he finds a total of 297 agreements to 70 disagreements. Still more striking is the result of a comparison of the 677 "individual variants" of Θ (readings not found in any of the unc'als recorded by Swete) with the same two cursives. Of 677 such readings, 262 are found in both 54 and 75, 68 in 75, 38 in 54, or a total of 368 cases; in 32 instances Θ is sup-

<sup>33</sup> See above, p. 46.

<sup>34</sup> See above, p. 44.

ported by **54, 75** alone, and in many others the only other witnesses are the "Hesychian" **44**, cet. or "Lucianic," **19, 108**, or both.

On page 42, a list is given of the 32 cases in which **Θ**, **54, 75**, stand alone; they are for the most part considerable variants, and the number is augmented by 10 instances of **Θ 75** and 3 of **Θ 54**, making 45 in all.

In Joshua the relation is widely different. Here out of 346 readings of **Θ** without uncial support (in Swete's apparatus), only 61 are found in **54, 75**, and of these two-thirds "are also supported by the Hesychian or Lucianic cursives." In the light of the relation of F to the "Hesychian" cursives, which in 20 cases out of 35 are joined by **54, 75**, "the conclusion seems unavoidable that in Joshua **54** and **75** are rather strongly under the influence of an Hesychian or similar Hexaplaric source." Elsewhere we read of "the Lucianic tendency of B"—meaning that **19, 108** are not infrequently found in B's company—and the less marked "Hesychian tendency" of **Θ** in Deuteronomy.

It might be thought that, so long as we know that for Sanders "Lucianic" is equivalent to **19, 108**, and "Hesychian" to **44, 74**, cet., there was no great harm in the names, even if they are mistakenly applied. This is, however, far from the truth; for Hesychian connotes an Egyptian recension, and Lucian is Syrian. The full consequence of operating with these question-begging names comes out when Professor Sanders undertakes to construct a stemma of the principal uncials and of the recensions represented by families of cursives in Deuteronomy and Joshua, respectively. In these stemmata, the K text (**K, 54, 75**) which has been repeatedly proved to be that of the Antiochian Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, is made to derive from the "Later Egyptian" text, contaminated in Joshua with "Hesychius." Doubtless, the noteworthy concurrence of **54, 75** in Deuteronomy with the Washington Codex, of the Egyptian character of whose text he has no doubt, influenced the author's judgment. The facts are obviously susceptible of an entirely different interpretation.

On the other side of the stemma, the position assigned to Origen is remarkable. The unsolved and extremely difficult problem, what kind of a text was used by Origen as the basis of his critical labors,

is disposed of off-hand: it was a Syrian text, on another branch of which Lucian stands. Aside from the antecedent improbability of this hypothesis,<sup>35</sup> all the investigations which have been made in different books of the Old Testament—partial and inconclusive though they are—point in a different direction. What is even more remarkable in these stemmata is that Origen's recension has no lineal descendants; it is transmitted only through Lucian and Hesychius, whose revisions represent respectively a fusion of Origen with another branch of the Syrian tradition and with an offshoot of the late Egyptian text. In Deuteronomy, as has been noted above, B is asserted to exhibit a late Egyptian text contaminated with Lucian. Enough has perhaps been said to make clear the value of these premature genealogies.

It is much to be regretted that so laborious an investigation of the affinities of the new uncial should be in large part vitiated by a fundamentally false method. Not only are the inferences rendered worthless, but the value of the observations is impaired, because they were made on erroneous suppositions; for example, the true relation of **44, 74, 106, 134** to **54, 75** is completely inverted.

Every serious bit of investigation in any spot in the Greek Bible reveals in some new way the immense variety and baffling complexity of the problems it presents. If it is a question of the grouping of manuscripts, we find that a codex which in one book or one division of the Old Testament holds constantly to a certain company, shifts its allegiance in another, as, to take an example already noted, Cod. **59** belongs to the K group in Judges, but not in Joshua; **82** goes with **93, 19, 108** in Samuel and Kings, but not in the Octateuch, in Judges its affinities are not the same as in Joshua; **118** has different allies in Joshua and in Kings. Even within the limits of one book, a codex may completely change sides; **44** in Judges presents the B text in the first and the last chapters of the book, but goes with the other version (group **74, 106, 134**) in the intervening chapters; **82** in the Books of Kings alternates for considerable portions between the type of **93, 19, 108**, to which group it belongs, and the vulgar

<sup>35</sup> Origen's text-critical studies began in Alexandria, long before he settled at Caesarea (see Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 1, p. 71, n.). Caesarea itself was much more closely connected with Alexandria than with Antioch.

text, in consequence, as Rahlfs has proved,<sup>36</sup> of the accidental loss in one of its ancestors of a number of leaves, and the restoration of the missing portions by copying from a manuscript of a different class. It would be easy to multiply these illustrations; but what has been said is enough to show the necessity of examining the witnesses severally and in minute detail, before building large hypotheses on their testimony.

Nor is this all. The Septuagint is not a version of the Old Testament, made at one time and place, or under one authority, but a collection of independent translations of the several books or groups of books. These translations, transcribed on papyrus rolls or codices each containing one book of normal length, formed neither canon nor corpus. Not until the age of the great vellum codices were the books of the Old Testament brought together for the use of the Christian church in a physical unity. Even then, the bulkiness of the collection, especially in uncials, made a division necessary; the Octateuch, for example, forming a volume by itself, and thus having sometimes a separate history. In private copies single books or groups of books were doubtless often transcribed separately. Composite codices are therefore to be expected, in which more than one type of text is represented.

Of many books, there was more than one translation;<sup>37</sup> and early in the history of modern criticism, it was recognized that even in individual books the hand of more than one translator may be discerned. The syllabus of Hody, Lib. ii, cap. 10, is worth quoting on this point: "*Ab eisdem interpretibus, conjunctis studiis, non factam fuisse versionem, sed librorum diversorum, et partium etiam diversarum ejusdem libri, diversos fuisse interpretes; nec judicio unquam reliquorum submissas fuisse singulorum interpretum versiones, demonstratur ex diversa et prorsus contraria in quamplurimis locis interpretandi ratione. Hoc verum esse non solum de libris ceteris, sed etiam de ipsis Mosaicis.*"

Popper proved long ago that the last chapters of Exodus were not translated by the translator of the rest of the book, and Thackeray

<sup>36</sup> *Septuaginta-Studien*, 1.

<sup>37</sup> This multiplication of translations may be compared to the number of new Latin translations in the humanistic and Reformation period or to the variety of English versions current in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.



has recently found reason to think that in several books in which it had not previously been suspected more than one hand was at work:<sup>38</sup> in Samuel and Kings, in particular, he seems to have established that these books were not translated by one man nor at one time, but in parts, by at least three translators, one of whom was considerably later than the other two; the boundaries can still be distinctly seen. Proksch reaches a similar result in Ezekiel.

Contamination on a great scale was the inevitable consequence. Corrections of the Greek translation by the Hebrew, directly, or indirectly through versions esteemed more accurate or more literal, were doubtless introduced sporadically or extensively by many before Origen. Owners of manuscripts noted various readings on the margins of their copies, and following scribes intruded them into the text or substituted them for it. Finally, copyists or private scholars who had a feeling for Greek diction and idiom tried to improve the expression by converting the often barbarous translation jargon into something less offensive to educated taste.

For three or four hundred years these processes had been going on before the more methodical revisions of the third century A.D.—Origen, Lucian, Hesychius. The magnitude and rapidity of change had been greatly accelerated by the appearance of the new Jewish versions, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, and the unknown authors of Origen's Quinta and the rest.

The revisions themselves, so far from putting an end to the confusion, gave it a new impulse by their example and by the fund of new material they furnished. When it is remembered that we possess no codices that antedate the age of these recensions, and comparatively little other evidence, and that most of the manuscripts contain an eclectic or mixed text, even the outsider may have a dim comprehension of the task which this mass of material sets for the critic.

The only sound method is plainly to investigate single books or natural series of books such as the Pentateuch or Samuel and Kings separately; to group the manuscripts which habitually go together in characteristic readings; to distinguish within the group those

<sup>38</sup> See *Journal of Theological Studies*, IV, 245 ff., 398 ff., 578 ff.; VIII, 262 ff.; IX, 88 ff. L. Köhler and J. Schäfers have made similar observations.

which most consistently present this type of text; to test their disagreements by the internal probability of readings on a sufficiently broad basis of induction, in order to determine objectively the relative weight to be given to their readings when they differ; and to try to localize the group in place and time by means of secondary versions and quotations in ecclesiastical writers. It can then be judged whether the group possesses the marks of a recension in the proper sense, or represents a local variety of the common type. In the case of recensions, it must be inquired what the character of the text was which was made the basis of the revision. When the several families of manuscripts in the book under investigation have thus been determined and examined, it will be in order to compare them and ascertain, if possible, their relations to one another. The genesis of mixed types may thus be made clear, and perhaps the region and age in which they became current. Eventually the results of such exact investigations will be compared with similar researches in other parts of the Bible, and such inferences drawn or hypotheses framed as the evidence warrants.

These investigations ought not to be prejudiced by the expectation that three distinct recensions are everywhere to be discovered, to which we may attach the names of Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius, together with the *Koinḗ*, and in the end, perhaps, the unrevised "Septuagint." The problems are not nearly as simple as that, and such a scheme imposed from without can only stand in the way of a solution, as the attempts to discover Hesychius by elimination prove.

This investigation requires a philological equipment and training such as not many critics are fortunate enough to possess, and must by its very extent often be co-operative. It is made more difficult by the fact that the text of the secondary versions frequently presents problems similar, on a smaller scale, to those which confront us in the Greek Bible, and that the quotations in the Fathers are often justly suspected of being conformed, by scribes or editors, to a more familiar type of text. The apparatus is huge and clumsy; to operate with it is the matter of a special education.

The larger Cambridge "Old Testament in Greek," as it proceeds, will lessen this difficulty somewhat by presenting a verified conspectus of a selected body of evidence, in as perspicuous an arrangement as

the complexity of the testimony admits; but it will not take the place the completer apparatus—Holmes and Parsons, for example, is not rendered superfluous. In addition to the usefulness of the edition itself, it is reasonable to anticipate that the close examination of the witnesses incidental to its preparation will lead to important results in determining the nearer and remoter affinities of manuscripts and versions.<sup>39</sup>

An admirable example of the methodical investigation of a peculiarly complicated problem is found in Torrey's "Ezra Studies,"<sup>40</sup> in which he proves, what had been previously surmised, that First Esdras is a fragment of the oldest Greek translation of Ezra-Neh.-Chron., and that the translation of these books among the canonical books in our Greek Bible is a later version, which he identifies with Theodotion. For the latter, he luminously discusses the text of the manuscripts of the A and the B classes, establishing the superiority of the former; the hexaplar MSS of Chron.-Ezra-Neh.; the versions made from Origen's "Septuagint"; the two main branches of the Greek tradition; the Syrian tradition, the Lucian recension and our L text; the critical process in restoring the Semitic text. Quite apart from the value of the results, which are in themselves of the highest importance, the critic of the Greek versions cannot fail to derive the greatest profit from a close study of these chapters of Torrey's work from the point of view of method, and the old practitioner will probably learn more from it than the tyro.

The Books of Samuel and Kings present in some respects the most promising point of attack upon the problem of recensions. The differences of the principal types of text are so salient that evidence which in some books has to be sought far afield here stares the critic in the face. In these books, too, readings expressly attested

<sup>39</sup> It was an error of judgment, to which the editors were, however, committed by Swete's manual edition, to fill the place of the missing leaves of B in Genesis (1—46:28) by A. The consequence of this change of base is that the collations change alignment correspondingly. The text of B is preserved in a considerable number of cursives, among them some very good ones, and the methodically correct procedure would have been to supply the lacuna in B from these manuscripts. The superstition that codices in uncial letters are inherently better than those in minuscules is probably ultimately responsible for the mistaken preference of A. The Sixtine editors did better.

<sup>40</sup> Chicago, 1910.

as Lucian's by notes in the margin of Greek codices and of the hexaplar Syriac confirm the evidence of the quotations in the Antiochian Fathers.

In 1893 and 1894, Silberstein, in two articles in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, investigated the character and origin of the types of text represented by A and B, respectively, in I Kings, and reached the conclusion that A in that book is derived from the recension of Origen, while B contains a text closely akin to that which formed the basis of Origen's revision. The inquiry was, however, conducted on too narrow lines to settle so difficult a question.

The most important recent contributions to the methodical study of the Antiochian recension in the Books of Kings have been made by Rahlfs. In the first of his *Septuaginta-Studien* (1901), he examined in minute detail Theodoret's quotations from the Books of Kings and from II Chronicles. The investigation confirmed the observation of earlier critics that Theodoret commonly quotes a text of the type represented in Lagarde's edition and in group of manuscripts on which that edition was based. Rahlfs finds, however, a considerable number of passages in which Theodoret's text does not agree with that of Lucian, but follows the common run of manuscripts or goes its own individual way, and he discusses instructively the nature and the explanation of these differences. Another study is devoted to the quotations in the writings of Origen, mustering in one array those which are made from Origen's revised text, and in another those which exhibit an unrevised text, with due consideration of the ambiguous cases. The chronology of Origen's chief works makes it possible to deduce from this investigation some interesting results for the history of his text-critical labors: the Hexapla of Kings, for example was in existence as early as A.D. 240, when the letter to Julius Africanus was written, but apparently not when the commentary on Exodus was composed a few years earlier.

It comes out, as might be expected, that even in his latest works, Origen not infrequently quotes the unrevised, or common, text—just as the revisers of the English Bible in the last generation undoubtedly often quoted the common version long after the new one was published. Rahlfs examines further into the relation of the non-hexaplar quotations of Origen to our Greek manuscripts, and

finds that they agree most closely with the text of B and the Ethiopic version<sup>41</sup>, which in Kings is near of kin to B. From the agreement he infers that in these books B Aeth. contain substantially a pre-Origenistic text; a result, so far as B is concerned, in accord with that to which Silberstein was led by his comparison of A and B, and with Cornill's revised judgment about B in Ezekiel.

The third part of the *Septuaginta-Studien* (1911)<sup>42</sup> is devoted to a study of Lucian's recension of the Books of Kings (3-4 Reg.). Lagarde's edition of this recension is without critical apparatus, and the editor nowhere set forth the principles on which he constructed the text. From his papers, now in the University Library in Göttingen, Rahlfs shows that in these books the text is based primarily on 93 of Holmes and Parsons (now Brit. Mus. Reg. i. D. 2); into a transcript of this manuscript Lagarde introduced, from his collations of other members of the group, readings which he preferred to those of 93, beside changes without manuscript support. In the former, he was guided, not by a critical estimate of the relative authority of the witnesses—though in collating them he had acquired some familiarity with their character—but chiefly by his own sense of what was right in the individual instances, the intrinsic probability of single readings. On similar grounds, he not infrequently "corrected" proper names against the authority of all the codices, and occasionally emended for grammatical reasons; a certain number of inadvertent departures from the tradition also found their way into his text. These improvements are not indicated in any way, so that it might befall an easy-going critic to operate on the long-suffering Hebrew text with a reading of "Lucian" which was in reality an emendation—or a slip—of Lucian's editor. The value of Lagarde's edition, therefore, as Rahlfs justly says, and, we may add, as all who have used it in connection with Parsons' apparatus have long known, is that it gives in convenient form a general view of the character of the recension which it represents; for the minute study of that recension it is inadequate. This Lagarde expressly recognized; and he would have been the first to condemn the abuse which has been made of it.

<sup>41</sup> In the purer form in which it appears in the best two of Dillmann's codices.

<sup>42</sup> Part 2 (1907) is on the text of the Septuagint Psalter.

Upon the basis of Lagarde's collations, checked by those in Parsons, Rahlfs has made a methodical investigation of the relations of the four manuscripts which in Kings constitute the L group to one another, and of the relative value of their text. They fall into two sub-groups, **19, 108**, and **82, 93**.<sup>43</sup> Tested by the internal probability of readings, the second of these couples is found to be markedly superior to the first. On the side of **82, 93** stand also the recently published fragments of an uncial palimpsest of the sixth century, and presumably of Mesopotamian or Syrian provenience, containing fragments of 3 Reg.<sup>44</sup> The quotations in Theodoret, the Old Latin on the margin of the Vulgate Cod. Goth. Legionensis,<sup>45</sup> and the Latin quotations in Lucifer of Cagliari, generally give their support to the second group. Consequently, when the array divides into these two sub-groups, the presumption is on the side of **Z, 82, 93**, though cases in which the better reading is preserved in **19, 108**, are not altogether infrequent; readings supported by **19** or **108** singly seldom demand consideration. Lagarde's edition, being based on **93**, largely, but not consistently, conforms to this principle.

It is well known that **108** (Cod. Vat. Gr. 330), borrowed from Rome by Cardinal Ximenes, was the foundation of the Greek text in the Complutensian Polyglott, which thus, in Samuel and Kings, follows in a general way the Antiochian recension. In very many places, however, it departs from this type, and Rahlfs has examined afresh these deviations and the reasons for them. The Spanish editors assumed that that form of the Greek text had the best claim to be the uncorrupted version of the Seventy which most closely agreed with the Hebrew and with the Latin Vulgate translated by St. Jerome from the Hebrew; consequently they frequently preferred to the reading of **108** that of other manuscripts which more exactly corresponded to the Massoretic text, and when they found none which answered this demand, they sometimes conformed the Greek to the Hebrew without any manuscript authority. The facts have long been known, and Méchineau had no need to take a statement

<sup>43</sup> Cod. 127 (Moscow), collated only for the first chapter of each book (by Matthaei for Holmes and Parsons), attaches to this pair.

<sup>44</sup> Codex Zuqninensis Rescriptus V.T. Edited by E. Tisserant (*Studi e Testi*, 23). Rome 1911.

<sup>45</sup> Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones*, II.

of them as an imputation on the good faith of the editors. The description of their procedure given by Flaminius Nobilius in the preface to the Latin counterpart to the Sixtine Septuagint (1588) can hardly be improved on. He compares their method to that of Origen: they necessarily transposed the Greek (e.g., in 3 Reg. or Jeremiah) to make it consort with the Hebrew in the first column. "Deinde longius progressi, cum e Graecis unicam darent, in eo iam non Exapla, sed alteram illam Origenis editionem hac in parte imitandam sibi statuerunt, ut quae in Hebraico erant, si in LXX deessent, ex alia interpretatione explerent: in eo autem ab Origenis instituto discesserunt, quod quae in LXX supererant, quaeque Origenes satis habuerat obelo notare, ipsi saepenumero resecarunt, ac praeterea delectu ipsarum etiam dictionum habito, collatisque exemplaribus, non modo Biblicorum, sed etiam Graecorum commentariorum, ubi varia se offerebat lectio (quod frequentissime euenit), eam probarunt ac retinuerunt, quae ad Hebraicam propius accederet, quamuis id, aut libris destituti aut taedio victi, non perpetuo fecerint.<sup>46</sup>

The interesting thing is that in this first edition of the Septuagint the editors went about their task quite as those of the third century had done, and produced another mixed recension.

Besides the manuscripts which exhibit the text of Lucian, Lucianic readings are found in the margin of the hexaplar Syriac version, sometimes explicitly so attributed, in other cases identifiable as such. Among Greek codices, Lucian appears in the margin of the Coislinianus (X of Holmes and Parsons, M of the Cambridge editors), which breaks off at I Kings 8:40, and in 243. In the latter—a Catena manuscript—the Lucianic marginal readings are apparently derived from Theodoret. There are, further, certain manuscripts which, though presenting in the main a different type of text, incorporate numerous characteristic Lucianic readings; and others in which such readings are found sporadically. By an examination of these groups Rahlfs has made an interesting contribution to the subject. He has also noted that the text of certain lectionaries is chiefly taken from the same recension.

An additional witness to the Antiochian text, as Ceriani observed

<sup>46</sup> This was common property of the learned in the seventeenth century; see, e.g., Ussher, *Syntagma*, c. 8 (Works, VII, 513).

in 1869, is the revision of the Peshitto after the Greek undertaken by Jacob of Edessa about 705. Rahlfs, who independently rediscovered the fact, cites several characteristic readings from I Kings 1 (the manuscript breaks off at verse 40).

It is a question of high critical importance what the character of the text was which Origen took as the basis of the Septuagint column in his Hexapla, or Lucian for his revision, and how these basal texts are related to each other. Or, to put the question of Lucian more specifically, was the text that underlies his recension of the same general type which Origen also used and which runs as the common element through the great mass of our manuscripts, or was it characteristically different from that type? Mez thought it demonstrable that Josephus had before him a Greek Samuel which diverged widely from A and B and habitually agreed with Lagarde's Lucian, and that he follows this text even against the Hebrew.<sup>47</sup> It would follow that a text having the distinctive Lucianic physiognomy was current two centuries before Lucian, and the part of the latter would be reduced to a comparatively superficial revision. The case, in short, is like that of Theodotion before Theodotion, in New Testament quotations, for instance.

Rahlfs re-examines with great care the evidence alleged by Mez and the whole subject of Josephus' use of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek version, extending the scope of the investigation to the Books of Kings. His conclusion is that Mez has much exaggerated the measure and significance of the agreement between Josephus and L, but that, particularly in Samuel, some readings which in our tradition appear as specifically Lucianic were current at a much earlier time. He pursues the inquiry through the quotations in other Greek writers down to the close of the third century A.D. including Theophilus of Antioch, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Origen, and the Syriac Didascalia. The material is in several cases too meagre to signify much, but so far as it goes the result is the same: "Lucianic" readings are found here and there, along with many of different associations, but nowhere the characteristic features of the recension.

The close affinity of some forms of the Old Latin version to the Antiochian Greek makes it probable that they represent a translation

<sup>47</sup> Die Bibel des Josephus, 1895.



made from this recension of the Greek or revised after it.<sup>48</sup> Rahlfs accordingly musters the quotations from Kings, beginning with Tertullian, and the fragments of the version independently preserved. Tertullian and Cyprian show no characteristic coincidences with Lucian; Lucifer of Cagliari, on the other hand, quotes extensively from Kings in a text which, though mixed, is in large agreement with the Antiochian Greek. Whatever explanation of this phenomenon be adopted—whether it be that Lucifer, who wrote the work in question during his exile in the East, translated for himself from a Greek text of that type, or whether between Cyprian and Lucifer a revision of the Latin version had been made which brought it into conformity with the Greek text current in Syria—there is no evidence that the earliest Latin version, made perhaps in the second century, had “Lucianic” peculiarities.

The result of this examination of the scanty and not always unambiguous external evidence is negative: it does not prove that the underlying text of the Antiochian recension was widely and characteristically different from that which, in various modifications, runs through the great body of the tradition. Further progress toward a positive solution of the problem can be made only by a methodical examination of the Lucian text itself. This examination fills the second part of Rahlfs' monograph. To begin with, he sets out for a single chapter (I Kings, chap. 1) a conspectus of all the variations between L and the common type of Greek text. These are very numerous, and in places are so accumulated as almost to give the impression that we are dealing with different translations, but on the other hand, striking doublets in which the common rendering appears in L side by side with a second translation, and many agreements inconsistently alternating with disagreements, seem to point to a common original. An analytical examination of the variants shows that many of them are explicable as corrections in L to bring the translation into closer agreement with the contemporary Hebrew text; others as changes made under the influence of parallel or similar passages; many are evidently improvements of the Greek in diction, inflection, syntax, and style. There is a remainder, especially large in the proper names, which is not accounted for in any of these ways.

<sup>48</sup> The same relation, as is well known, exists in the New Testament.

The hypothesis suggested by the minute investigation of this one chapter is confirmed by an examination of the significant variations through the rest of the two Books of Kings: the text that formed the basis of Lucian's critical operations was substantially of the same type which is common to the other branches of the tradition, though, as would be anticipated, it had individual peculiarities. Pursuing the inquiry further, Rahlfs finds that, of the witnesses in our hands, the text underlying the recension of Lucian stands closest to B, and to the Ethiopic version in the older and purer form represented by Dillmann's codd. S and A, the affinity of which to B in Kings has long been known. This text was "pre-hexaplar," and Lucian is sometimes, especially in I Kings, an important witness to this text, by the side of B, Aeth.

In the changes to conform to the Hebrew—which in I Kings involve large transpositions—Lucian is often in accord with Origen, and he has many readings which are attested for Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and, in II Kings, for the Quinta. How far the latter agreements are due to the use of these translations, how far to independent recourse to the Hebrew text, is in many cases difficult or impossible of decision. Whether Lucian availed himself of the great apparatus which Origen got together in the Hexapla, or whether he had his own separate copies of Theodotion and such other translations as he employed in his revision, and whether, if he did not consult the Hexapla itself, the original—and perhaps the sole—manuscript of which was preserved at Caesarea, he made use of a copy of the separate edition of the fifth column which Eusebius and Pamphilus published, are questions which Rahlfs does not discuss<sup>49</sup>—perhaps because it did not seem possible to get beyond inconclusive general considerations.<sup>50</sup> It is clear that whatever his acquaintance with the work of his great predecessor may have been, Lucian went his own way; he frequently corrects passages, for example, which Origen left untouched, and corrects others in a different way. His end, indeed, was not to put the critic in possession of all the materials for the restoration of the pure original translation of the Seventy, but to

<sup>49</sup> See, however, p. 173.

<sup>50</sup> Another question which Rahlfs does not touch is the influence of the Syriac Bible on Lucian; a question which would perhaps reward fuller investigation than it has received from Driver (*Text of the Books of Samuel*, lxxvii) and Stockmayer (*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XII (1892), 218–223).

produce a revised edition for the practical use of the church, and he was therefore both bolder and less systematic than Origen.

Rahlfs' monograph is an important contribution to the criticism of the Greek Bible, and with its exhaustive investigation of a sharply defined specific problem marks the way in which further progress will be made. Many similar investigations will be necessary before it will be possible to establish on firm ground a classification of the manuscripts even for one great branch of the tradition. It is evident, for example, that if, in Jerome's time, the recension of Lucian prevailed in Asia Minor and the patriarchate of Constantinople as well as in Syria, this did not permanently continue to be the case. The great bulk of the codices which come from that region present a different aspect. One family exhibits a text which contains many specifically Lucianic readings combined in varying proportions with others as distinctly not Lucian's. Do these represent a revision of the *Kouñ* after Lucian or a contamination of Lucian with another recension, presumably Origen's, or both? Does this mixed text stand in any relation to the revision which Basil is said to have made?<sup>51</sup> An inquiry as methodical and searching as that which Rahlfs has devoted to Lucian might be expected to clear up this question. It presents certain peculiar difficulties, among which the history of the Armenian version is not the least.

Where so many intricate details are considered, it need hardly be said that not all the author's interpretations and explanations of the evidence carry the same degree of conviction; other solutions sometimes suggest themselves as possible or even as more probable, but a discussion of such points would extend this notice beyond all measure. Let it be said in conclusion that Rahlfs has brought to his task a knowledge of the problems and the resources of criticism which only years of occupation with the subject can give; the questions are clearly defined, the material thoroughly digested, and the possible interpretations judiciously weighed, the inferences cautiously limited to the scope of the evidence; critical tact—developed by training and experience—is everywhere apparent; the presentation is so orderly and lucid that it is a real pleasure to follow the author through it.

<sup>51</sup> It may be recalled that, according to Syncellus, Basil corrected a copy of the Bible, which was preserved in the library at Caesarea in Cappadocia, and one singular reading is recorded which we find in a small group of cursives.